



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,577	12/22/2003	Gerard H. ROUSSEAU	117423	1576
27074	7590	03/28/2006	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			TRAN, LY T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2853	

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/707,577	Applicant(s) ROUSSEAU, GERARD H.	
	Examiner Ly T. TRAN	Art Unit 2853	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/22/03</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 15, 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipate by Rousseau et al (USPN 6,068,372).

With respect to claims 15-19, Rousseau discloses an apparatus and a method of installing a drum maintenance unit in a media device comprising:

- A positioning mechanism/releasably securing that properly positions the drum maintenance unit to a media device and provides electrical contact with the media device when the drum maintenance unit is installed in the media device (Column 10; line 29-42)
- Wherein the positioning mechanism provides a signal to the media device when the drum maintenance unit is properly installed in the media device (Column 10: line 29-32)
- Aligning a roller of the drum maintenance unit with a corresponding portion of the media device (fig.3, fig.4)

- Providing an electrical connection comprising providing a data connection between the media device and the drum maintenance unit (10: line 29-32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reeves (USPN 5,808,645) in view of Nguyen et al (USPN 6,428,225).

With respect to claim 1-5 and 9-12, Reeves discloses a drum maintenance unit comprising:

- Releasably secures the drum maintenance unit to a media device and provides electrical contact with the media device when the drum maintenance unit is installed in the media device (Fig.5, Column 4: line 54-67)
- Provides a signal to the media device that the drum maintenance unit is properly installed in the media device, sensing mechanism in electrical contact, sensing mechanism comprises a data device and data connection between the data device and a media device when the drum maintenance unit is installed in the media device and an electrical for the drum

maintenance unit when the drum maintenance unit is installed in a media device (column 4: line 54-67 Column 10: line 36-56)

However, Reeves et al. fails to teach the latching mechanism and a recess formed in a portion of one of the drum maintenance unit and a media device and a corresponding member on the other of the drum maintenance unit and the media device, the corresponding member being adapted to engage the recess when install the cassette in the media device.

Nguyen et al. teaches the latching mechanism and a recess formed in a portion of one of the drum maintenance unit and a media device and a corresponding member on the other of the drum maintenance unit and the media device, the corresponding member being adapted to engage the recess when install the cassette in the media device (fig.10, Column 4: line 49-67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the latching mechanism as taught by Nguyen et al. The motivation of doing so is for preventing the cassette from sliding out of the cavity of the media device.

Nguyen discloses the claimed invention except for the shaped of the recess. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have a V shaped, since applicant has not discloses that the V-shaped of the recess solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any shaped of the recess.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 6-8 and 13-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 6-8 are allowable over prior art of record because at least prior art have not been found to anticipate or teach a protective layer provided between the data connection point of the data device and the media device when the drum maintenance unit is installed in the media device.

Claims 13 and 14 is allowable over prior art of record because at least prior art of record have not been found to anticipate or teach the V-shaped slot has a first surface that has a first dimple, and the first surface is oriented so that at least the first dimple is in contact with the corresponding member of the device.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 1/26/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Rousseau does not teach or suggest releasably securing the drum maintenance unit to the media device in a desired position and simultaneously providing an electrical connection between the drum maintenance unit and the media device as recited in claim 17. This argument is not deemed to be persuasive because referring to column 10; line 29-42 and figure 3, Rousseau discloses these limitations.

Applicant argues that Reeves does not disclose or teach releasably secures the drum maintenance unit to a media device. This argument is not deemed to be persuasive because referring to the previous office action, Nguyen et al. teaches the latching mechanism, not Reeves.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ly T. TRAN whose telephone number is 571-272-2155. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30am-5pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Meier can be reached on 571-272-2149. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LT

March 23, 2006



STEPHEN MEIER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER